

### **Remarks**

This is in response to the election of species requirement set forth in the office action mailed September 11, 2006.

The examiner is thanked for indicating that the subject matter of species shown in figures 1-2 is patentably distinguishable from the species shown in figure 3.

The applicant hereby elects to pursue the invention of species shown in figures 1-2, and the applicants hereby make this election with traverse. The applicants traverse this requirement because a complete search of the subject matter of the elected species must necessarily include a search for the non-elected species such that there is no burden on the examiner for maintaining these species within the same application.

Claims 1-3, 5-17 and 23 are believed to read on the elected species. The examiner has already noted that several claims are generic. The number of generic claims is believed to further support a withdrawal of this restriction requirement.

Reconsideration of the restriction requirement and favorable action on all of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted;

Keevican Weiss Bauerle & Hirsch LLC

/Blynn L. Shideler/

Blynn L. Shideler, Reg. No. 35,034

11th Floor, Federated Investors Tower

1001 Liberty Avenue

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222

Phone: 412.355.2617

Cell: 412-480-1882

Facsimile: 412.355.2609

email: bshideler@kwbhllaw.com